

ESTABLISHING A "CORRECTIONS CALENDAR" IN THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 16, 1995.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany H. Res. 168]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 168, amending clause 4 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House to abolish the Consent Calendar and to establish in its place a Corrections Calendar, by a record vote report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be adopted.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this resolution is to modernize an existing, underutilized, and obsolete calendar (the Consent Calendar), which has not been used since the 101st Congress. The Consent Calendar will be transformed into a Corrections Calendar, on which the Speaker of the House may, after consultation with the Minority Leader, place bipartisan and narrowly targeted bills designed to address specific problems with federal rules, regulations, statutory laws, and court decisions which are ambiguous, arbitrary, or ludicrous, or impose a severe financial burden on Americans.

SUMMARY OF THE LEGISLATION

The resolution transforms the Consent Calendar (clause 4 of rule XIII) into a Corrections Calendar.

The Speaker may, after consultation with the Minority Leader, place bills on the Corrections Calendar only after they have been

reported by committees and placed on either the House or Union Calendar.

Bills must be on the calendar for at least three legislative days before being called up, at the discretion of the Speaker, on the second and fourth Tuesday of each month.

Bills called up on the Corrections Calendar would be considered in the House with one hour of debate, and there would not be consideration of amendments under the five minute rule (except for amendments recommended by the primary reporting committee or offered by the chairman).

A motion to recommit by the minority, with or without instructions, is permitted.

A three-fifths vote is required to pass a bill from the Corrections Calendar.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On Tuesday, May 2, 1995, the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House of the Committee on Rules and the Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources and Regulatory Affairs of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight held a joint hearing on Speaker Newt Gingrich's proposal to create a Corrections Day in the House of Representatives specifically for correcting legislative and regulatory mistakes. The hearing focused on the nature and scope of the problems to be addressed by Corrections Day, and examined procedural options to facilitate a Corrections Day process. The establishment of a Corrections Calendar was one such procedural option discussed at the hearing.

Witnesses included Speaker Newt Gingrich; Majority Whip Tom Delay; Representative Barbara Vucanovich; Representative Brian Bilbray; the Hon. Roger Cornett, Mayor of Richmond, Indiana; Mr. James S. Herr, Chairman and CEO, Herr Foods, Inc.; Dr. Jim Thurber, Professor of Government, The American University; Mr. William Pitts, Vice President, Government Relations, Capital Cities/ABC, Inc.; Mr. David Mason, Director, U.S. Congress Assessment Project, the Heritage Foundation; and Mr. Peter Robinson, Attorney, Bailey & Robinson.

On Tuesday, June 13, 1995, the Committee on Rules held an open hearing on H. Res. 161. The Committee heard from Representatives Barbara Vucanovich, William Zeliff, David McIntosh, John Dingell, Cardiss Collins and William Clinger. The Committee also heard from Dr. James Thurber of American University, and Dr. Roger Davidson, Department of Government and Politics, University of Maryland. Testimony was also provided by Representatives George Miller, Steny Hoyer and William Clay.

On Thursday, June 15, the Committee met to mark-up H. Res. 161. The Committee favorably reported a privileged resolution consisting of the text of H. Res. 161 as amended by the Committee by a record vote of 9 to 4, and moved that H. Res. 161 be laid on the table. During the mark-up, three amendments to H. Res. 161 and drafted report language were agreed to.

BACKGROUND

The concept of a Corrections Day was first conceived at a meeting of Republican Governors and House Speaker Newt Gingrich. As envisioned by the Speaker, the House of Representatives would set aside one or two days each month to vote on narrowly targeted bills to repeal government actions "so dumb and so expensive" they would be approved by an overwhelming bipartisan vote. The source of corrections ideas is likely to be primarily constituents, small business owners, and state and local government officials.

In his statement before the joint subcommittees on May 2, the Speaker outlined three objectives for the Corrections Day process: (1) to create a better balance between bureaucrats and citizens; (2) to set a standard of common sense by "bringing up the dumbest things and repealing them"; and (3) to enhance Congressional oversight over federal agencies.

Also during the May 2 hearing, several laws and regulations were cited as examples of misguided, onerous, and arbitrary government actions that should be reminded by a Corrections Day process. Rules Committee Chairman Jerry Solomon cited a Safe Drinking Water Act requirement that "hotel and motel owners put up unsafe drinking water signs, killing tourism and costing hundreds of jobs, just because they aren't on a municipal water supply, and they meet all the other health regulations, all of them." He also noted that the EPA's so-called "Cluster Rule" could force the closure of 33 U.S. paper mills and the elimination of 21,000 jobs.

House Majority Whip Tom Delay noted that, "under the Clean Air Act one can end up in jail for filling out a form incorrectly. You can be forced to pay \$600,000 for failing to fill out a Federal form even if you have complied with an identical State law. OSHA requires employers to provide detailed safety information and training regarding the use of such hazardous substances as diet soda, Joy dish washing liquid, and chalk."

The Mayor of Richmond, Indiana, Roger Cornett, criticized regulations under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) which require that new buses purchased by the city be equipped with wheelchair lifts "even though we are operating a fully equipped paratransit system." Mayor Cornett noted that, since the new buses started running last year, only one citizen has used the wheelchair lifts mandated by the ADA. "It is an example of an unnecessary expenditure in our community because of the one-size-fits-all mentality," he stated.

On March 23, 1995, the Speaker Gingrich appointed a Corrections Day Steering Group consisting of Representatives Barbara Vucanovich, Bill Zeff, and David McIntosh to develop a framework for the consideration of corrections measures. The steering group recommended establishing a "Corrections Calendar" to facilitate the consideration of Corrections Day measures. On Tuesday, June 6, 1995, Representative Barbara Vucanovich introduced H. Res. 161, amending clause 4 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House to abolish the Consent Calendar and to establish in its place a Corrections Calendar. This rule change seeks to modernize an existing, under-utilized, and obsolete calendar, known as the Consent Cal-

endar. As illustrated by the following chart, the Consent Calendar has not been used since the 101st Congress.

PROCEDURAL METHODS BY WHICH BILLS ARE CALLED UP IN THE HOUSE

Congress	Called up under Suspension of the Rules	Called up as Privileged Matter	Called up by Unanimous Consent	Called up by Rule	Called up by Private Calendar	Called up by D.C. Calendar	Called up by Consent Calendar	Called up by Special Order
103rd	483	289	160	108	6	0	0	0
102nd	613	282	265	143	45	7	0	0
101st	572	280	416	103	37	1	3	5
100th	617	270	459	97	6	0	26	4
99th	428	277	546	91	50	4	34	1
98th	421	296	494	136	64	14	46	4

Source: Ilona Nickels, Congressional Research Service.

The Consent Calendar, as amended, was created in 1909 as a means to address a progressively increasing work load in the House of Representatives. The procedure is based on the unanimous consent procedure and is designed to facilitate passage of non-controversial measures. As a result of the availability of other parliamentary vehicles to expedite the passage of non-controversial legislation—mainly suspension of the rules and the unanimous consent technique—use of the Consent Calendar has fallen out of favor as a useful method for calling up bills in the House.

ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATION

The resolution amends clause 4 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House to transform the existing Consent Calendar procedure into the Corrections Calendar procedure.

The proposed Corrections Calendar procedure maintains the existing procedure of reporting bills from the committee of jurisdiction and gives authority to the Speaker to assign bills to the Corrections Calendar. Consideration will follow existing rules of debate for consideration in the House, meaning one hour of debate, no amendments (unless recommended by the primary reporting committee or by its chairman), and a motion to recommit with or without instructions. If a bill fails to achieve a 3/5ths vote but does achieve a majority, it will remain eligible for a special rule.

If it so chooses, the House leadership retains the same flexibility to utilize any of the current procedural mechanisms used for calling up legislative measures for floor consideration in lieu of using the Corrections Calendar device. They are:

Unanimous Consent.—This allows for quick passage of non-controversial measures, cleared in advance. In current practice, bills brought up by unanimous consent are not subject to amendment and no debate is conducted except brief exchanges made under “reservation of objection.” This was the primary procedure used for consideration of commemorative measures in previous Congresses.

Suspension of the Rules.—This is used for passage of measures that enjoy substantial, but not unanimous, support. This procedure allows for 40 minutes of debate, permits no amendments, inherently waives all points of order, and requires a two-thirds vote for passage.

Special Rule from the Rules Committee.—The could be utilized for measures that violate House rules with respect to the Budget

Act, legislating in an appropriations bill, or appropriating in an authorization bill, to name a few. It could also accommodate limitation amendment-style bills. The House would adopt a rule reported by the Rules Committee to allow for debate and possible amendments.

Only bills favorably reported by a committee and placed on the House or Union Calendar would be eligible for placement on the Corrections Calendar. The Speaker will be responsible for determining which reported bills should also be placed on the Corrections Calendar. This proposed rule does not specify either the criteria to be used for determining what bills should be placed on the Corrections Calendar or the mechanism to be used by the Speaker in making such decisions. This has been done out of deference to the scheduling prerogatives of the majority leadership and the need to retain flexibility on such decisions. However, the Committee hopes that the Speaker will pursue his originally-stated aim of seeking bipartisan advice on both the criteria to be used and the specific bills to be scheduled. The rule as amended by the Committee takes a step in that direction by requiring advance consultation by the Speaker with the Minority Leader before the bill is placed on the Corrections Calendar. The Committee hopes the speaker will build on this bipartisan spirit of cooperation in other ways to ensure the success of this new process.

The resolution gives the Speaker the discretion to have the Corrections Calendar called on the second and fourth Tuesday of each month after the Pledge of Allegiance. Bills on the Corrections Calendar would be called in numerical order, i.e., in the order in which they have been placed on the Calendar. Bills must be on the Corrections Calendar for at least three legislative days; this does not supersede the existing requirement in House rules that a bill cannot be considered until the third calendar day that the report has been available to House Members (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays).

Bills called up on Corrections Day would be subject to one-hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the primary committee of jurisdiction. Consideration of a Corrections Day bill would be in the House instead of the Committee of the Whole meaning there would not be a consideration of amendments under the five-minute rule. Only amendments recommended by the reporting committee or offered by the chairman would be in order, and they would have to be discussed within the hour of general debate.

The rule orders the previous question on passage of the bill and any amendments, meaning there could be no intervening motions or votes on the previous question (though amendments would be separately voted on before final passage), but there could be a motion to recommit by the minority, with or without instructions.

A three-fifths vote of those present and voting would be required to pass a bill from the Corrections Calendar, and failure to achieve the three-fifths vote would not cause the measure to be removed from its original calendar. It would only be removed from the Corrections Calendar. This means the bill would still be eligible for a special rule from the Rules Committee that could make in order

amendments, and which would only require passage by majority vote.

The Corrections Day rule differs from consideration under suspension of the rules not only in the different super-majority vote requirement, but also because it requires that bills be favorably reported and on the House or Union Calendar first, it does not waive any points of order against the measure (except that it implicitly precludes a point of order that the measure must be considered in the Committee of the Whole), and it does allow for a motion to recommit.

MATTERS REQUIRED UNDER THE RULES OF THE HOUSE

Committee vote

Clause 2(l)(2)(B) of rule XI requires each committee report to accompany any bill or resolution of a public character, ordered to be reported, to include the total number of votes cast for and against on each rollcall vote on a motion to report and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, and the names of those members voting for and against. On June 15, 1995, the Committee ordered reported a privileged resolution consisting of the text of H. Res. 161, as amended, to the House, and that H. Res. 161 be laid on the table, by a record vote of 9 to 4, a quorum being present.

Pursuant to clause 2(l)(2)(B) of House rule XI the results of each rollcall vote on an amendment or motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and against, are printed below:

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 150

Date: June 16, 1995.

Measure: H. Res. 161, Amending House Rules to Create a Corrections Calendar.

Motion By: Mr. Moakley.

Summary of Motion: Amendment in nature of a substitute to consider corrections bills under the suspension of the rules procedure on two days a month designated by the Speaker.

Results: Rejected, 3 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 151

Date: June 15, 1995.

Measure: H. Res. 161, Amending House Rules to Create a Corrections Calendar.

Motion By: Mr. Beilenson.

Summary of Motion: Strike three-fifths vote requirement for corrections bills and replace with a two-thirds vote requirement.

Results: Rejected, 3 to 8.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 152

Date: June 15, 1995.

Measure: H. Res. 161, Amending House Rules to Create a Corrections Calendar.

Motion By: Mr. Beilenson.

Summary of Motion: Require the concurrence of the minority leader before a measure could be placed on the Corrections Calendar.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 153

Date: June 15, 1995.

Measure: H. Res. 161, Amending House Rules to Create a Corrections Calendar.

Motion By: Mr. Dreier.

Summary of Motion: Require consultation with the minority leader before a bill could be put on the Corrections Calendar.

Results: Adopted, 9 to 4.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Yea; Dreier—Yea; Goss—Yea; Linder—Yea; Pryce—Yea; Diaz-Balart—Yea; McInnis—Yea; Waldholtz—Yea; Moakley—Nay; Beilenson—Nay; Frost—Nay; Hall—Nay; Solomon—Yea.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 154

Date: June 15, 1995.

Measure: H. Res. 161, Amending House Rules to Create a Corrections Calendar.

Motion By: Mr. Moakley.

Summary of Motion: Give Rules Committee chairman authority, by direction of committee, to place bills on the Corrections Calendar.

Results: Rejected, 4 to 9.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Nay; Dreier—Nay; Goss—Nay; Linder—Nay; Pryce—Nay; Diaz-Balart—Nay; McInnis—Nay; Waldholtz—Nay; Moakley—Yea; Beilenson—Yea; Frost—Yea; Hall—Yea; Solomon—Nay.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 155

Date: June 15, 1995.

Measure: H. Res. 161, Amending House Rules to Create a Corrections Calendar.

Motion By: Mr. Quillen.

Summary of Motion: Report a new resolution to the House favorably consisting of the text of H. Res. 161, as amended, and lay H. Res. 161 on the table.

Results: Adopted, 9 to 4.

Vote by Member: Quillen—Yea; Dreier—Yea; Goss—Yea; Linder—Yea; Pryce—Yea; Diaz-Balart—Yea; McInnis—Yea;

Waldholtz—Yea; Moakley—Nay; Beilenson—Nay; Frost—Nay; Hall—Nay; Solomon—Yea.

Committee cost estimate

Clause 2(l)(3)(B) of rule XI requires each committee report that accompanies a measure providing new budget authority, new spending authority, or new credit authority or changing revenues or tax expenditures to contain a cost estimate, as required by section 308(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended and, when practicable with respect to estimates of new budget authority, a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant program (or programs) to the appropriate levels under current law. Clause 7(a) of rule XIII requires committees to include their own cost estimates in certain committee reports, which include, when practicable, a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant program (or programs) with the appropriate levels under current law.

No cost estimate is required under this section because the resolution does not provide new budget authority, new spending authority, or new credit authority, nor does the resolution provide an increase or decrease in tax expenditures.

Congressional Budget Office estimates

Clause 2(l)(3)(C) of rule XI requires each Committee to include a cost estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, pursuant to section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, if the cost estimate is timely submitted. No cost estimate was received from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

Inflation impact statement

Clause 2(l)(4) of rule XI requires each committee report on a bill or joint resolution of a public character to include an analytical statement describing what impact enactment of the measure would have on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy. The Committee has determined that the resolution has no inflationary impact on the nation's economy.

Oversight findings

Clause 2(l)(3)(A) of rule XI requires each committee report to contain oversight findings and recommendations required pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X. The Committee has no oversight findings.

Oversight findings and recommendations of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Clause 2(l)(3)(D) of rule XI requires each committee report to contain a summary of the oversight findings and recommendations made by the Government Reform and Oversight Committee pursuant to clause 4(c)(2) of rule X, whenever such findings have been timely submitted. The Committee on Rules has received no such findings or recommendations from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

COMPARATIVE PRINT

Clause 4(d) of rule XI requires that, whenever the Committee on Rules reports a resolution amending or repealing the Rules of the House of Representatives, the accompanying report must contain a comparative print showing the changes in existing rules proposes to be made by the resolution.

Changes in existing Rules of the House of Representatives made by the resolution, as reported, are shown as follows (existing rules proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing rules in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

RULE XIII OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE XIII

CALENDARS AND REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

1. * * *

* * * * *

【4. After a bill has been favorably reported and shall be upon either the House or Union Calendar any Member may file with the Clerk a notice that he desires such bill placed upon a special calendar to be known as the "Consent Calendar". On the first and third Mondays of each month immediately after the reading of the Journal, the Speaker shall direct the Clerk to call the bills in numerical order which have been for three legislative days upon the "Consent Calendar". Should objection be made to the consideration of any bill so called it shall be carried over on the calendar without prejudice to the next day when the "Consent Calendar" is again called, and if objected to by three or more Members it shall immediately be stricken from the calendar, and shall not thereafter during the same session of that Congress be placed again thereon: *Provided*, That no bill shall be called twice on the same legislative day.】

4. (a) *After a bill has been favorably reported and placed on either the Union or House Calendar, the Speaker may, after consultation with the Minority Leader, file with the Clerk a notice requesting that such bill also be placed upon a special calendar to be known as the "Corrections Calendar". On the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month, after the Pledge of Allegiance, the Speaker may direct the Clerk to call the bills in numerical order which have been on the Corrections Calendar for three legislative days.*

(b) *Bills so called shall be considered in the House, debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the primary committee of jurisdiction reporting the bill, shall not be subject to amendment except those amendments recommended by the primary committee of jurisdiction or those offered by the chairman of the primary committee, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except on motion to recommit with or without instructions.*

(c) *A three-fifths vote of the members voting shall be required to pass any bill called from the Corrections Calendar but the rejection*

of any such bill, or the sustaining of any point of order against it or its consideration, shall not cause it to be removed from the Calendar to which it was originally referred.

* * * * *

VIEWS OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Clause 2(l)(5) of rule XI requires each committee to afford a three day opportunity for members of the committee to file additional, minority, or dissenting views and to include the views in its report. Although neither requirement applies to the Committee, the Committee always makes the maximum effort to provide its members of such an opportunity. The following views were submitted:

MINORITY VIEWS

We agree that it could be useful for the House of Representatives to try a new way of facilitating changes in problematic laws, and we think that the Speaker's idea of establishing a "corrections" process has promising possibilities. However, we believe that the procedure that would be created by this new rule for Floor consideration of so-called corrections bills is both unfair to the minority and unnecessary. And, inasmuch as the entire corrections process has not been well thought out, we think that it is premature for the House to act now on any rule change for this purpose.

Proponents of the resolution have failed to make a convincing case for the need to establish a new and different legislative procedure for considering corrections bills, which have been described by proponents as relatively noncontroversial bills addressing laws and regulations that most people would agree do not make much sense. The House already has a procedure—suspension of the rules—that permits the expedited consideration of relatively noncontroversial bills. This procedure has been a feature of the House since 1822, and is well-accepted by both minority and majority members. It ensures that bills considered by that method have bipartisan support and are noncontroversial by requiring a two-thirds vote for passage.

In contrast, the reported resolution provides for a procedure in which only a three-fifths vote is required for passage, making it possible that a bill considered under this process will not have bipartisan support. We would point out that during five of the last ten Congresses, one party held three-fifths of the seats in the House.

Because bills considered under the corrections procedures would not be subject to amendment (other than an amendment by the committee of jurisdiction and a motion to recommit), we believe strongly that they should meet the same test for bipartisanship imposed on bills considered under the suspension process, which also prohibits most amendments. The right to offer amendments is important to all Members, but it is particularly important to minority members, offering the opposition party its best opportunity for meaningful involvement during Floor consideration of a bill. We think that it would be a serious mistake for the House to abandon its longstanding protection of minority floor rights by requiring anything less than a two-thirds vote to waive those rights.

We are also troubled that the Committee has voted to report this resolution without a clear definition of a corrections bill; an explanation of how the corrections process will work before a committee reports a bill; or what roles the corrections advisory group, individual Members, committees, and the leadership will play in the process. Until more information on those matters is provided, we believe it is unwise for the House to act on any measure establishing

an unusual legislative procedure for considering corrections bills, particularly one that vests in one person—the Speaker—the sole authority to determine which bills qualify for this procedure.

At the very least, we believe that the minority party should have a formal role in determining which measures may be brought up under correction procedures, as it does in determining the scheduling of measures other than those considered under regular order. In the case of the suspension process, for example, the Republican Conference rules state that “the Speaker shall not schedule any bill or resolution for consideration under the suspension of the rules which * * * has not been cleared by the minority.” With respect to the Consent Calendar, a bill will be struck if, on the second time it is called, at least three members object. In addition, the Speaker has announced that he will not recognize a member for a unanimous consent request to consider an unreported measure unless there is an assurance that the majority and minority floor and committee leadership have no objection.

The Speaker said repeatedly in testimony before our Committee’s Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House and the Government Reform and Oversight Committee’s Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs that he wanted the corrections process to be bipartisan. Indeed, he stated emphatically that “if this is going to work, it has to be bipartisan.”

Yet despite the Speaker’s exhortations, there has been little sign of bipartisanship in this matter. No minority members were involved in the development of this resolution. No minority amendments, other than through a motion to recommit, would be permitted to a corrections bill. No minority members have been brought into the corrections process, and the Minority Leader has been unable to secure assurances that the minority party will be able to select its own members for the corrections advisory group, as has been the longstanding tradition in the House for appointments to committees and all other formal bipartisan panels.

We urged the majority to try using the existing suspension process for corrections legislation before establishing this new corrections procedure. Alternatively, we proposed changing the three-fifths margin for passage of corrections bills to two-thirds. We also asked that a motion to recommit be permitted during consideration of corrections bills. And, we proposed requiring the Minority Leader’s concurrence to place bills on the Corrections Calendar.

We also asked that appointments to the corrections advisory group—which is expected to play a pivotal role in the corrections process—be made in the same manner as appointments are made to other formal bipartisan panels, with the minority members chosen by their own leadership. And, we asked that the bipartisan Leadership define corrections bills, and issue guidelines for the corrections process, before utilizing the Corrections Calendar.

All these proposals were offered not only to safeguard minority rights, but also to protect the integrity of the legislative process in the House. Unfortunately, except for the inclusion of a motion to recommit—which is already required under the Rules of the House—our proposals were rejected by the majority members of the Committee.

We are extremely disappointed that the majority has chosen to follow a path of partisanship in this matter, rather than accept our modest suggestions which would ensure broad—if not unanimous—support for the corrections process. The rejection of our proposals will make the corrections process the kind of partisan one which the Speaker himself warned will not work.

We urge the House membership to oppose this resolution in the form in which it has been reported, and to work with us to develop a corrections process that will be embraced by members of both parties.

JOE MOAKLEY.
MARTIN FROST.
ANTHONY C. BEILENSON.
TONY P. HALL.

